

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated April 20, 2005. A Request for a three-month extension of time is submitted concurrently herewith, along with authorization to charge Deposit Account 23-3000 in the amount of \$510.00 for the requisite fee, and therefore the period for response extends up to and includes October 20, 2005, and this paper is timely filed. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the subject Office Action, claims 6, 26, 42 and 44 were objected to; 59 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph. Moreover, claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 27-28, 46-47 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,631,748 to Harrington (Harrington). In addition, claims 2-3, 6, 9-10, 30-31 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,696,604 to Curry (Curry); claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Curry and U.S. Patent No. 5,982,989 to Broddin (Broddin); claim 66 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,919 to Kemmochi (Kemmochi); claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Curry, Broddin and Kemmochi; claims 7, 13-14, 17, 19-20, 24-25 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,463 to Delabastita (Delabastita); claims 15, 18, 21-22 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Delabastita and Curry; claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Delabastita, Curry, Broddin and Kemmochi; claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Delabastita, Curry and Broddin; claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,196,451 to Pellar (Pellar); claims 43, 35, 48-49, 60-62, 64, 68-69 71 and 75-76 were rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,729,632 to Tai (Tai); claims 33-37, 39-41, 50-52, 54-58 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Delabastita and Tai; claims 53 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Delabastita, Tai and Kemmochi; claims 63 and 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Tai and Curry; claim 72 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Tai and Delabastita.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections to the extent that they were made at the time of the Office Action. Applicant has nonetheless canceled claim 6 and amended claims 1-2, 14, 20-21, 26-27, 30, 33, 42-48, 55-57, 61, 63 and 67 in deference to the suggestions of the Examiner and further the remaining claims onto issuance. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is being added by the above amendments, as the amendments are fully supported in the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

As an initial matter, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the personal interview between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on June 29, 2005. In the interview, proposed amendments to the claims to address the art-based rejections were discussed. At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner stated that the proposed amendments would overcome the rejections based on the cited art.

To this end, a number of the independent claims have been amended to recite that overlapping dots of a halftone cell are of the same (not multiple) halftone screen. Per the suggestion of the Examiner, claim language referencing frequencies has further been amended to specify "line" frequencies and to resolve any perceived lack of clarity. As discussed during the interview, none of the cited art teaches or suggests such features.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, or which might otherwise further this case onto allowance, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned at (513) 241-2324. Moreover, if any other charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

10/17/05
Date



Douglas A. Scheler
Reg. No. 52,197
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.
2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Telephone: (513) 241-2324
Facsimile: (513) 241-6234

Page 15 of 15
Serial No. 09/939,932
Amendment and Response dated October 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2005
W&H&E PHOT/02
K-YPHOT/02Amendment and Response re 4-20-05 OA.wpd